



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,028	11/15/2001	Jonathan H. Fischer	41	4995

7590 06/27/2003

Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
Locust Valley
90 Forest Avenue
New York, NY 11560

EXAMINER

AL NAZER, LEITH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2828

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/002,028

Applicant(s)

FISCHER, JONATHAN H.

Examiner

Leith A Al-Nazer

Art Unit

2828

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Paul Ip

PAUL IP

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dotson et al '296.

With respect to claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-17, Dotson teaches an input stage (figure 4) and an output stage (figure 8) being operatively coupled to the input stage; a current generator circuit; the input stage being configured to include first and second differential pairs (figure 4); the first differential pair (30 and 32) having the differential input data signal applied thereto, and being implemented using MOS devices; the second differential pair receiving as its inputs corresponding outputs of the first differential pair, and being implemented using bipolar devices (200 and 202); the first and second differential pairs being configured such that application of the differential input data signal at a substantially rail-to-rail voltage swing to the first differential pair will not exceed a junction reverse bias constraint of the second differential pair.

With respect to claims 3 and 10, Dotson teaches the output stage comprising a differential pair (154 and 156 in figure 8; 170 and 172 in figure 8).

Art Unit: 2828

With respect to claim 18, Dotson teaches the circuit comprising a limiting amplifier.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained ~~through the invention is not identically disclosed or described as~~ set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dotson '296 in view of Kaminishi '481.

Claims 7 and 14 require the second differential pair comprise SiGe bipolar transistors having the reverse bias constraint. SiGe bipolar transistors are common devices and are often used in driver circuits, as is evidenced by Kaminishi '481 (column 9, lines 1-10). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the SiGe bipolar transistors of Kaminishi with the system as taught or suggested by Dotson. The motivation for doing so would have been to obtain a system with the proper reverse current bias

Art Unit: 2828

characteristics. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kaminishi with Dotson to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7 and 14.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments, see pages 3-5 of paper no. 10, filed 5 May 2003, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-18 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the newly cited prior art, Dotson et al '296. Dotson teaches a first differential pair (30 and 32) being implemented using MOS devices and a second differential pair being implemented using bipolar devices.

Communication Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leith A Al-Nazer whose telephone number is 703-305-2717. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Ip can be reached on 703-308-3098. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7724 for regular communications and 703-308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-3329.



PAUL IP

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Application/Control Number: 10/002,028

Page 5

Art Unit: 2828

LA

June 24, 2003